

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claim Status

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ghaffari (U.S. 5,751,220). Claims 2–4, 23–26, and 37–40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious due to Ghaffari in view of Olson (U.S. 7,127, 633). Claims 5–8, 14–18, 27–30, 35, 41–44, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious due to Ghaffari in view of Olson in further view of Sergeant (U.S. 4,007,448 A). Claims 9, 10, 20, 31, 36, 45, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious due to Ghaffari in view of Olson in further view of Nguyen (U.S. 6,941,357 B2). Applicants respectfully traverse the claim rejections because the cited art fails to teach or suggest every claim limitation. Claims 13, 15–22, 34, 48, and 51–53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite.

Claims 11, 12, 32, 33, 46, and 47 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claims 13, 19, 21, 22, 34, 48, and 51–53 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under § 112, and to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Because the independent claims are allowable as explained below, Applicants opt not to amend the objected claims into independent form.

Applicants amend claims 13, 15, 19, 34, and 48 to overcome the rejections under § 112. Applicants amend claim 1, 15, 23, and 37 to incorporate the limitations of claims 5, 16, 27, and 41

respectively. Accordingly, Applicants cancel claims 5, 16, 27, and 41. Claims 1–4, 6–15, 17–26, 28–40, and 42–53 remain pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 Second Paragraph

Applicants amend claims 13, 15, 19, 34, and 48 to overcome the rejections under § 112 second paragraph. As such, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 13, 15–22, 34, 48, and 51–53 under § 112 second paragraph be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1, as amended, recites “the first synchronization signal comprises a value from a word counter coupled to the master circuit.” Independent claims 15, 23, and 37 recite a similar limitation. The prior art fails to teach or suggest the quoted language. With regard to claim 5, now canceled, Examiner cites Sergeant at col.16 ¶.65–col.17 ¶.10 as allegedly teaching the quoted language. However, at the cited location, Sergeant teaches:

The word counter register 82 initially stores the initial word count, i.e., the number of words to be involved in a data transfer. The number stored is usually the two's complement of the actual word count and the register 82, which is a counter, is incremented during each transfer of a word over the synchronous data path between the controller and the system. When the register 82 reaches ZERO (i.e., the register overflows or issues a CARRY), the requested transfer is finished. This register can only be cleared by transferring a ZERO value to it through a local register writing operation.

Sergeant fails to teach or suggest that the word count register 82 provides a count value that is used as part of a synchronization signal as claimed. Indeed, the cited language merely teaches incrementing the register 82 during each transfer of a word and clearing the register when complete. Additionally, no other art of record teaches or suggests the claimed limitation, and

Examiner stated neither Ghaffari nor Olson discloses the utilization of word counters. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 15, 23, and 37 and dependent claims 2-4, 6-14, 17-22, 24-26, 28-36, 38-40, and 42-53 are allowable over Sergeant.

Conclusion

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this document. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this document, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Conley Rose, P.C.'s Deposit Account No. 03-2769/2120-02800/HTDC.

Respectfully submitted,

/Tim D. Chheda/
Tim D. Chheda
Reg. No. 60,752
Attorney for Applicants

Appl. No. 10/693,618
Amdt. dated Nov. 12, 2007
Reply to Office Action of Aug. 16, 2007

Conley Rose, P.C.
P.O. Box 3267
Houston, Texas 77253-3267
Ph: (713) 238-8000